UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,963	12/30/1999	ROGER L. BUIS	BO999023-003	7122

7590   05/22/2003

KURT P LEYENDECKER ESQ
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA   900251026

EXAMINER
STONE, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	8

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/475,963	BUIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jonathan D Stone	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 May 2001_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20,24 and 25_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20,24 and 25_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claim(s) _21-23_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _3,4,5_ .	6) ☐ Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 12/30/99.

2.   IDS filed on 4/3/00 (paper 3).

3.   IDS filed on 11/30/00 (paper 4).

4.   IDS filed on 5/7/01 (paper 5).

5.   Claims 1-20 and 24-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 17, 24, and 25 are

independent claims. Claims 21-23 are subject to restriction as follows.

Election/Restrictions

6.   Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

> I.   Claims 1-20 and 24-25, drawn to formatting data with parameters specified for
>
> data identifiers, classified in class 715 subclass 522.
>
> II.   Claims 21-23, drawn to extracting and arranging data from a database, classified
>
> in class 707, subclass 1.

7.   Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single

combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be

separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as rearranging or

organizing a database or extracting query-specific data. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

8.   Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination

purposes as indicated is proper.

9.   Additionally, because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the

search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as

indicated is proper.

10.   During a telephone conversation with Mr. Gordon R. Lindeen III on 4/24/03 a

provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute invention I, claims 1-20 and 24-25. A

change of power of attorney was received on 4/25/03 and the election was confirmed with Mr.

Lindeen on 4/29/03. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this

Office action. Claims 21-23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

11.   Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the

inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR

1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 17-18, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over DeRose et al (herein DeRose; USPN 5708806 –filing date 6/7/1995).

13.   **Regarding independent claim 1,** DeRose teaches a method for generating electronic

documents (col 3, ln 14-21). DeRose teaches a plurality of data records in a file, referred to as

elements, which may contain text (col 3, ln 34-36). Each element has associated with it a type

name for use as an identifier (col 3, ln 37-43; compare with *"associating...data record;"*).

DeRose teaches the use of a style sheet. Style sheets specify format characteristics

corresponding to type names (col 3, ln 44-52; compare with *"specifying...a document;"*).

DeRose also teaches formatting the data according to the associated parameters when

generating the document (col 3, ln 19-21; compare with *"formatting...document."*).

DeRose does not explicitly cite performing the method of the invention with a datastream

as input. However, DeRose does disclose an input of a file with a plurality of segmented input

data (col 7, ln 61-66). The input of datastreams into the invention taught by DeRose would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time. This would have enabled a plethora

of documents to utilize the formatting advantages given by DeRose.

14.   **Regarding dependent claim 3,** DeRose teaches style sheets containing formatting data

to be included in the generated document (col 3, ln 44-52).

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 4,** DeRose teaches printing a document on a screen as an

output to a user (col 3, ln 14-21).

16.   **Regarding dependent claim 5,** DeRose discloses markup elements as having start or end

tags (col 4, ln 1-3). These tags acts as identifiers for the elements, and correspond to the

element's type name.

17.   **Regarding dependent claim 6,** DeRose discloses type names as having fixed size fields

(col 5, ln 40-48).

18.   **Regarding independent claims 10, 17, 24 and 25 and dependent claim 18,** the claims

incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and are rejected along the same

rationale. Additionally, DeRose discloses the implementation of his invention in a computer

system comprising a processor and storage memory (col 7, ln 18-52).

19.   **Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12,** the claims incorporate substantially similar

subject matter as claims 4 and 3, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 2, 13, 14-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

DeRose in view of W3C, HTML 4.01 Specification: W3C Recommendation, 24 December

1999, esp. ch. 11 (herein HTML 4.01).

20.   **Regarding dependent claim 2,** DeRose discloses associated a type name for use as an

identifier with data (col 3, ln 37-43; compare with *"associating...data record;"*). DeRose also

teaches the use of a style sheet for specifying format characteristics corresponding to type names

(col 3, ln 44-52; compare with *"specifying...a document;"*).

DeRose does not explicitly disclose creating regions that define an area in a document.

However, HTML 4.01 does disclose creating tables in an HTML document that allow data to be

arranged and formatted in a certain region of a document page (see 11.1). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of

DeRose and HTML 4.01. DeRose's invention is based on markup languages (SGML and

HTML, for example). Applying specifications that were known and typical at the time of the art

would have made the invention useful to those of ordinary skill in the art, specifically in this

instance by allowing users more control over page formatting and data placement.

21.   **Regarding dependent claims 13 and 20,** the claims incorporate substantially similar

subject matter as claim 2 and are rejected along the same rationale.

22.   **Regarding dependent claims 14-16,** the claims are drawn to the positioning of data in a

multi-page document. It was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention to

implement data properties that served to repeat specific data in certain parts of the document

throughout a plurality of pages. Examples of this include the header and footer options. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

the combination of DeRose and HTML 4.01 to implement these options. Such a combination

would have allowed users to generate documents with such standard options, reducing a user's

workload of repeating text and possibly reducing the document size.

Claims 7-9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose in

view of Hâkon Wium Lie, W3C Core Styles, 1997 (herein Core).

23.   **Regarding dependent claim 7-9,** DeRose does not explicitly disclose associating

identifiers with data in one computer and specifying parameters in another computer. However,

Core teaches the use of style sheets in such a way that a style sheet is fetched off a server for use

with a document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teaching of DeRose and Core in order to provide users with the option

of using prefab style sheets and formatting alternatives. Associating identifiers with data is done

as disclosed by DeRose in the instant claim's base rejection. The style sheets specify parameters

for identifiers (as per the rejection of claim 1, also reference W3C Cascading Style Sheets, level

2: CSS2 Specification). Core teaches an implementation in a network when disclosing a browser

fetching a style sheet from a server.

Additionally, Core does not explicitly disclose formatting data on a third computer

according to the specified parameters. However, it was known and typical in the art at the time

of the invention for third party users to access web documents on their own computers. Core

teaches creating a document referencing a style sheet on a server. This document may have been

a web page, wherein an author different from the referenced style sheet author provided the

content data. When a third party user accessed the page, the content would have accessed the

server to retrieve the style sheet, further formatting the document for user viewing.

Furthermore, Core's disclosure teaches the first computer providing the style sheet as a

server. It was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention for servers to allow access

to data, but not to access data on the requestor's computer unless explicit permission was

granted.

24.   **Regarding dependent claim 19,** the claim incorporates substantially similar subject

matter as claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

25.   Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.

US-5,708,806	To:	DeRose et al.
US-6,014,677	To:	Hayashi et al.
US-5,899,975	To:	Nielsen, Jakob
US-6,484,166	To:	Maynard, George
US-6,243,501	To:	Jamali, Hamadi

W3C Cascading Style Sheets, level 2 CSS2 Specification *W3C Recommendation*
www.w3.org/TR/REC-CSS2 May 5 1998.

Conclusion

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jonathan D Stone whose telephone number is (703) 305-7854.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular

communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications. Responses to this action

may be mailed to:

> Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
> Washington, D.C. 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

> Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive
> Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JDS
May 1, 2003

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100